

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 11, 14-18, 22, 25, 27, 28, 31, 42, 44-48, 55-58, 62, 65, 67-72, 79-82, 86, 89, 91, and 92 have been amended. Claims 1-12, 14-32 and 34-92 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

### **Double Patenting Rejections:**

The Office Action provisionally rejected claims 1, 3, 8-10, 14, 17, 45, 47, 52-54, 56, 57, 69, 71, 76-78, 80 and 81 under the judiciary created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 20, 23, 26-28, 35, 37, 38, 41, 44-46, 53 and 55 of co-pending Application No. 10/642,928. Should this rejection become non-provisional, Applicants will consider filing a terminal disclaimer or present reasons traversing the rejection. Applicant also requests reconsideration of this rejection in light of the above amendments.

The Office Action rejected claims 18-28, 30 and 58-68 under the judiciary created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 15, 16, 18-23, 25, 32-34, 36, 41, 42, 44-49, 51, 54-56, 58, 63, 64, 66-71 and 73 of U.S. Patent No. 7,698,398. Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection in light of the above amendments.

### **Section 103(a) Rejections:**

The Office Action on page 6 rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 14-17, 45-47, 49, 50, 52-54, 56, 57 69-71, 73, 74, 76-78 and 80 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0233631) (hereinafter “Curry”) in view of Epionet, “Epiowave” (hereinafter “Epionet”) further in view of Huang et al. (“A Web Services-Based Framework for Business Integration Solutions”) (hereinafter “Huang”) and further in view of Olsen (U.S. Publication 2004/0243583) (hereinafter

“Olsen”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

**In regard to claim 1, as a first matter, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach program instructions that executable to implement a Web Services architecture design service for generating integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services with business systems, wherein the program instructions are executable to perform all of the elements as recited in claim 1.**

Curry teaches a “Web services development method” (Title). Curry’s Abstract describes “A method for rapid design, development, deployment and support of web applications based on web services with minimum customized programming, maximized reuse of software components and compliance with standard development frameworks.” Curry’s FIG. 1 illustrates “a flow chart illustrating the steps of a rapid web services development method according to an illustrative embodiment of the present invention.” (paragraph [0030]). However, nowhere does Curry teach that the method illustrated in FIG. 1 is a computer-implemented method, and Curry does not describe a computer system that implements the method illustrated in FIG. 1. At most, Curry describes that particular steps or sub-steps of Curry’s method may be assisted by or performed using existing software tools. For example, in paragraph [0072], cited by the Office, Curry states: “In an illustrative embodiment of the invention, the Epiowave™ environment available from the applicant, Epionet Corporation of Dublin, Ireland, serves as the D&D environment in the D&D application creation step 32.” As another example, in paragraph [0076], also cited by the Office, Curry states (emphasis added): “In an illustrative embodiment of the invention, a toolset called MindManager by MindJet LLC of Sausalito, Calif. is used to create mind-maps which assist in the steps of creating the Role Control Diagram 44 and performing the Use Case Analysis 46.”

On page 8 of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office admits that Curry does not teach implementing a Web Services architecture design service to generate

integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services with business systems, and asserts that it would have been obvious that “the system of Curry would include a Web Services architecture design service since the Epiowave toolset used in Curry is capable of planning, prototyping, testing, developing, and deploying web services.” The Office further argues this assertion in the Response to Arguments, 72, on pages 36-37. **However, as noted above, Curry only describes that the “the D&D application creation step 32” of FIG. 1 may be performed using Epiowave.** Curry does not describe that other aspects of Curry’s system relied upon by the Office are performed using Epiowave or any other automated system. Moreover, the Office has not explained how a combination of Epiowave with Curry would result in anything but the system that Curry already teaches, for example as illustrated in FIG. 1. Neither Curry nor any combination of the cited art teaches a computer-implemented system that implements all of the elements of the method as illustrated in Curry’s FIG. 1, nor does Curry or any combination of the cited art teach a Web Services architecture design service that performs all of the elements as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

The Epionet/Epiowave references, cited by the Office to support the assertion that Curry teaches the invention as claimed, may broadly assert that the toolset may provide for “planning, prototyping, testing, developing, and deploying web services;” however, the references do not teach that the Epionet/Epiowave platform performs the elements of the subject matter as recited in claim 1 for generating integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services with business systems.

Huang teaches a “Web services-based framework for business integration solutions” (Title). In Section 3, at page 18, second column, first full paragraph, Huang teaches “In this section, we propose a framework to develop Web services-based business integration solutions.” However, Huang only conceptually describes this framework, and does not teach or even suggest a computer implementation of the framework for developing Web services-based business integration solutions.

Olsen, on the other hand, describes systems and methods for providing web services in which an operator is prompted for information corresponding to a service, and a web service is automatically constructed in response to receiving the information (see, e.g., paragraphs [0004] and [0025]. However, Olsen's systems operates by maintaining generic web service(s) and generating customized web services according to the provided information. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0023]-[0024]; e.g., paragraph [0023] states in part "Once the generic web service system receives information corresponding to a desired domain, the generic web service system can prompt the service provider for additional information until a web service, e.g., web service 114, can be constructed for the service provider.") While Olsen does describe the automatic construction of a web service (e.g., "a web service is automatically constructed in response to receiving the information"); however, Olsen only teaches that generic web services are customized according to input information and does not teach program instructions executable by a processor to generate integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services with business systems, as recited in claim 1.

In contrast to the cited references, claim 1 recites a system for integrating Web Services with business systems, comprising: a processor; and a memory comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are executable by the processor to implement a Web Services architecture design service configured to generate integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services with business systems, wherein, to generate an integrated Web Service architecture for integrating a specific Web Service with a specific business system, the program instructions are executable by the processor to: generate the integrated Web Service architecture comprising a plurality of heterogeneous components of the specific business system in accordance with one or more Web Services integration design patterns for integrating Web Services with business systems; wherein, to generate the integrated Web Service architecture, the program instructions are executable by the processor to...<snip the elements performed by the program instructions>...and provide output indicating the generated integrated Web Service architecture for integrating the specific Web Service with the specific business system.

Furthermore, at paragraph [0022], Curry teaches (emphasis added): “Interface templates are also reviewed for compliance with a standard framework architecture.” In paragraph [0055], Curry teaches (emphasis added): “The framework as referred to in the present invention is an overall architecture which provides a template for building enterprise web solutions. The framework includes a pre-built architecture that allows developers to rapidly create applications based on business components and web services.” Thus, Curry does not teach a system comprising program instructions executable to implement a Web Services architecture design service configured to generate an integrated Web Service architecture for integrating a specific Web Service with a specific business system. Instead, Curry clearly teaches a “standard framework architecture” that clearly pre-exists and that may allegedly be used to “rapidly create applications based on business components and web services.”

On page 37 of the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office argues that “a specific instance of the framework template must be generated for the web service under development.” However, this “specific instance” would still be just a copy of Curry’s “standard framework architecture” that may be modified, and does not teach a system comprising program instructions executable to implement a Web Services architecture design service configured to generate an integrated Web Service architecture for integrating a specific Web Service with a specific business system, as recited in Applicant’s claims.

**The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach a system as recited in Applicant’s claim 1 when the claim is viewed as a whole.**

**In further regard to claim 1, the cited references do not teach at least the features of program instructions executable by a processor to generate one or more Use Cases for the integrated Web Service in accordance with the one or more Web Services integration design patterns, wherein each Use Case models a particular business scenario for the integrated Web Service, as recited in amended claim 1.**

The Office Action relies on Curry to teach “generate one or more Use Cases for the integrated Web Service,” citing Curry, paragraphs [0080]-[0084]. These paragraphs describe a step 46 in Curry’s FIG. 2, which expands on element 10 (“Business Logic Development”) of Curry’s FIG. 1 (see paragraph [0074]). At paragraph [0074], Curry states “During the business logic development step 10, a precise description of the customer’s business requirements or the business logic requirements of the web services under development are compiled by performing an orderly sequence of steps.” In paragraph [0076], Curry states “First, a set of Role Control Diagrams 44 is developed and a Use Case Analysis is performed 46.” However, Curry does not teach that this Use Case Analysis generates one or more Use Cases for an integrated Web Service in accordance with the one or more Web Services integration design patterns, as recited in amended claim 1.

The Office Action relies on Huang to teach integration design patterns, citing page 18, second column, paragraph 2 and page 20, first column paragraphs 2 and 3 and second column, paragraphs 1-3. In Section 3, at page 18, second column, first full paragraph, Huang teaches “In this section, we propose a framework to develop Web services-based business integration solutions.” In the first paragraph cited from page 20, Huang teaches “In essence, this framework uses four different design patterns...” However, Huang does not teach generating one or more Use Cases for an integrated Web Service in accordance with the one or more Web Services integration design patterns, as recited in amended claim 1.

Moreover, the other references fail to overcome this shortcoming, and no combination of the references teaches this subject matter as recited in claim 1.

**In further regard to claim 1, the cited references do not teach at least the features of program instructions executable by a processor to generate a high-level architecture for the integrated Web Service in accordance with the one or more Web Services integration design patterns, wherein the high-level architecture**

**identifies two or more entities of the integrated Web Service and the relationships and interactions among the entities, as recited in amended claim 1.**

The Office Action relies on Curry, citing paragraph [0097] and asserting “the context diagram describes the high-level architecture.” Paragraph [0097] states (emphasis added): “Once the various forms of project descriptions, including business rules 52, state diagrams 54, swim-lane diagrams 56 and activity diagrams 58 are complete, a context diagram 60 is prepared.” However, Curry does not teach that this context diagram is prepared in accordance with the one or more Web Services integration design patterns, as recited in amended claim 1.

The Office Action relies on Huang to teach integration design patterns, citing page 18, second column, paragraph 2 and page 20, first column paragraphs 2 and 3 and second column, paragraphs 1-3. In Section 3, at page 18, second column, first full paragraph, Huang teaches “In this section, we propose a framework to develop Web services-based business integration solutions.” In the first paragraph cited from page 20, Huang teaches “In essence, this framework uses four different design patterns...” However, Huang does not teach generating a high-level architecture for the integrated Web Service in accordance with the one or more Web Services integration design patterns, as recited in amended claim 1.

Moreover, the other references fail to overcome this shortcoming, and no combination of the references teaches this subject matter as recited in claim 1.

**In further regard to claim 1, the cited references do not teach at least the features of program instructions executable by a processor to generate a logical architecture for the integrated Web Service according to the business scenarios modeled by the one or more Use Cases and in accordance with the one or more Web Services integration design patterns, as recited in amended claim 1.**

The Office Action relies on Curry, citing paragraph [0055]-[0059] and asserting “the framework structure including a number of layers is the logical architecture.” However, Curry does not teach that the “framework structure” is generated according to the business scenarios modeled by the one or more Use Cases and in accordance with the one or more Web Services integration design patterns, as recited in amended claim 1.

Moreover, the other references fail to overcome this shortcoming, and no combination of the references teaches this subject matter as recited in claim 1.

**In further regard to claim 1, the cited references do not teach wherein the logical architecture identifies two or more logical components of the integrated Web Service and the relationship among the two or more logical components according to a plurality of integration tiers, and wherein the logical architecture comprises two or more layers, as recited in amended claim 1.**

The Office Action relies on Curry, citing paragraph [0055]-[0059] and asserting “the framework structure including a number of layers is the logical architecture.” However, Curry only teaches that the “framework structure” may include layers, and does not teach a logical architecture that identifies two or more logical components of the integrated Web Service and the relationship among the two or more logical components according to a plurality of integration tiers, and that teaches the logical architecture comprises two or more layers. Amended claim 1 recites both a plurality of integration tiers and two or more layers. Curry only teaches that the framework may include a number of layers, for example in paragraph [0056]: “The structure includes a number of layers or sub-architectures. Each layer addresses a specific area within a standard web application.” Curry does not teach a plurality of integration tiers and two or more layers, as recited in claim 1.

In the rejection of claim 2, the Office asserts that Curry teaches “defining a number of integration tiers,” citing paragraph [0151]. However, this citation refers to



“the logical layers of the application,” which appear to be the same “layers” referred to in paragraph [0056].

**In further regard to claim 1, the Office has failed to establish a proper reason to combine the references.**

In regard to the proposed combination of Curry and Huang, the Office Action asserts that “it would have been obvious...to have modified Curry such that the web service architecture is generated in accordance with one or more integration design patterns as taught by Huang because design patterns are well known in the art and commonly used by programmers since design patterns provide the benefit of capturing a standard solution to a common programming problem for reuse.” However, Huang teaches four specific design patterns – a Composite pattern, a Mediator pattern, a Command pattern, and a State pattern. It is unclear as to how Curry’s system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” as disclosed. Curry and Huang each propose distinctly different methods for achieving similar results. Modifying Curry with Huang’s specific “design patterns” would appear to necessitate significant changes in Curry’s system. “If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.” *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959). Thus, one of ordinary skill would not have combined the teachings of Huang with the teachings of Curry in the manner proposed by the Office. Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In the Response to Arguments, 77, on pages 37-38 of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office asserts that it is “not clear...why incorporating the use of design patterns in the development method taught by Curry would necessitate significant changes.” However, as Applicant has noted, Huang teaches four specific design patterns – a Composite pattern, a Mediator pattern, a Command pattern, and a State pattern.

These design patterns are specifically intended for use in Huang's "Web services-based framework for business integration solutions." (Title). Curry and Huang each propose distinctly different methods for achieving similar results. It is unclear as to how Curry's system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry's "Web services development method" as disclosed. Modifying Curry with Huang's specific "design patterns" would thus appear to necessitate significant changes in Curry's system. Moreover, while the Office broadly asserts that it is obvious that "one of ordinary skill in the art...would have the necessary skills to use design patterns for that particular problem," the Office provides no support as to how Curry's system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry's "Web services development method" as disclosed.

In regard to the Curry and Epiowave references, the Office Action asserts it would have been obvious that "the system of Curry would include a Web Services architecture design service since the Epiowave toolset used in Curry is capable of planning, prototyping, testing, developing, and deploying web services." However, at paragraph [0072] Curry states that "In an illustrative embodiment of the invention, the Epiowave™ environment available from the applicant, Epionet Corporation of Dublin, Ireland, serves as the D&D environment in the D&D application creation step 32." Curry does not describe that other aspects of Curry's system relied upon by the Office are performed using Epiowave. Moreover, the Office has not explained how a combination of Epiowave with Curry would result in anything but the system that Curry already teaches. Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks as those above regarding claim 1 also apply to claims 45 and 69.

Applicant also asserts that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims under the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection is further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

The Office Action on page 13 rejected claims 4, 48 and 72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry in view of Epionet, and further in view of Huang, Olsen and Connell, et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0074401) (hereinafter “Connell”). However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims from which these claims depend, a further discussion of this rejection is not necessary at this time.

The Office Action on page 14 rejected claims 7, 11, 51, 55, 75 and 79 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry in view of Epionet, and further in view of Huang, Olsen and Chappell, et al. (“Java Web Services”) (hereinafter “Chappell”). However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims from which these claims depend, a further discussion of this rejection is not necessary at this time.

The Office Action on pages 15-16 rejected claims 18-24, 27-29, 58-64, 67, 68, 82-88, 91 and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry in view of Epionet, and further in view of Siegel (“Using OMG’s Model Driven Architecture (MDA) to Integrate Web Services”), and further in view of Huang and Olsen. Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the reasons indicated below.

**In regard to claim 18, as a first matter, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach program instructions executable to implement a Web Services architecture design service for generating integrated Web Service architectures.**

As noted above in regards to claim 1, Curry does not teach that the method illustrated in FIG. 1 is a computer-implemented method, and Curry does not describe a computer system that implements the method illustrated in FIG. 1. At most, Curry describes that particular steps or sub-steps of Curry's method may be assisted by or performed using existing software tools. Huang only conceptually describes a framework for developing Web services-based business integration solutions, and does not teach or even suggest a computer implementation of the framework for developing Web services-based business integration solutions. The Epionet/Epiowave references may broadly assert that the toolset may provide for "planning, prototyping, testing, developing, and deploying web services," however, the references do not teach that the Epionet/Epiowave platform performs the elements of the subject matter as recited in claim 18. Olsen only teaches that generic web services are customized according to input information and does not teach program instructions executable by a processor to generate integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services with business systems.

On page 8 of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office admits that Curry does not teach implementing a Web Services architecture design service to generate integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services with business systems, and asserts that it would have been obvious that "the system of Curry would include a Web Services architecture design service since the Epiowave toolset used in Curry is capable of planning, prototyping, testing, developing, and deploying web services." The Office further argues this assertion in the Response to Arguments, 72, on pages 36-37. **However, as noted above, Curry only describes that the "the D&D application creation step 32" of FIG. 1 may be performed using Epiowave.** Curry does not describe that other aspects of Curry's system relied upon by the Office are performed using Epiowave or any other automated system. Moreover, the Office has not explained how a combination of Epiowave with Curry would result in anything but the system that Curry already teaches, for example as illustrated in FIG. 1. Neither Curry nor any combination of the cited art teaches a computer-implemented system that implements all of the elements of the method as illustrated in Curry's FIG. 1, nor does Curry or any

combination of the cited art teach a Web Services architecture design service that performs all of the elements as recited in claim 18 of the instant application.

In contrast to the cited references, claim 18 recites a system for generating integrated Web Service architectures, comprising: a processor; and a memory comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are executable by the processor to generate integrated Web Service architectures for implementing integrated Web Service business systems, wherein, to generate an integrated Web Service architecture for implementing a specific integrated Web Service business system, the program instructions are executable by the processor to: identify one or more components of the integrated Web Service architecture according to one or more use case requirements for the specific integrated Web Service business system, wherein each use case requirement specifies a particular business scenario for the integrated Web Service business system; define a plurality of integration tiers and one or more Web Services technologies according to a Web Services architecture integration framework; define how each of the plurality of integration tiers communicates with others of the plurality of integration tiers according to the Web Services architecture integration framework; organize the components according to the plurality of integration tiers and two or more layers of the integrated Web Service architecture; apply one or more design patterns to the integrated Web Service architecture, wherein the one or more design patterns include one or more Web Services integration design patterns for integrating Web Services with business systems; and provide output indicating the generated integrated Web Service architecture for implementing the specific integrated Web Service business system.

Furthermore, as noted above in regard to claim 1, in paragraph [0055] Curry teaches “The framework includes a pre-built architecture that allows developers to rapidly create applications based on business components and web services.” **Curry does not teach a system comprising program instructions executable to implement a Web Services architecture design service configured to generate an integrated Web Service architecture for implementing a specific integrated Web Service business system.** Instead, Curry clearly teaches a “standard framework architecture” that clearly

pre-exists and that may allegedly be used to “rapidly create applications based on business components and web services.”

On page 37 of the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office argues that “a specific instance of the framework template must be generated for the web service under development.” However, this “specific instance” would still be just a copy of Curry’s “standard framework architecture” that may be modified, and does not teach a system comprising program instructions executable to implement a Web Services architecture design service configured to generate an integrated Web Service architecture for integrating a specific Web Service with a specific business system, as recited in Applicant’s claims.

**The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach a system as recited in Applicant’s claim 18 when the claim is viewed as a whole.**

**In further regard to claim 18, the Office has failed to establish that the cited references teach, program instructions executable by a processor to: identify one or more logical components of the integrated Web Service architecture according to one or more use case requirements for the specific integrated Web Service business system, wherein each use case requirement specifies a particular business scenario for the integrated Web Service business system, as recited in amended claim 1.**

The Office Action relies on Curry to teach these features, citing FIG. 2, paragraphs [0051]-[0052], and paragraphs [0074]-[0080]. FIG. 2 expands on element 10 (“Business Logic Development”) of Curry’s FIG. 1 (see paragraph [0074]). However, Curry does not specifically teach that element 10 (“Business Logic Development”) of Curry’s FIG. 1 is computer-implemented. Curry thus does not teach program instructions executable by the processor to identify one or more logical components of the integrated Web Service architecture according to one or more use case requirements for the specific integrated Web Service business system, wherein each use case requirement specifies a particular business scenario for the integrated Web Service business system, as recited in

Applicant's claim 18. The other cited references fail to overcome these shortcomings of Curry.

**In further regard to claim 18, the cited references do not teach at least the features of, program instructions executable by a processor to: translate the one or more use case requirements for the specific integrated Web Service business system and one or more technical constraints for the specific integrated Web Service business system to determine a plurality of Web Service components for the integrated Web Service architecture, wherein the Web Service components include software components, as recited in claim 18.**

In the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office admits that Curry and Epionet do not teach program instructions executable by a processor to translate one or more use case requirements for a specific integrated Web Service business system and one or more technical constraints for the specific integrated Web Service business system to determine a plurality of Web Service components for an integrated Web Service architecture, wherein the Web Service components include software components. The Office asserts that Siegel teaches these features, citing page 5, last paragraph, page 6, paragraphs 1-3, and page 8, last paragraph. The Office asserts that Siegel teaches MDA tools that "generate interface definitions, application code, makefiles, and configuration files for the PSM's middleware platform." However, Applicant can find nothing in Siegel that specifically teaches that the MDA tools translate one or more use case requirements for a specific integrated Web Service business system and one or more technical constraints for the specific integrated Web Service business system to determine a plurality of Web Service components for an integrated Web Service architecture.

Furthermore, the Office has not provided a proper *prima facie* reason to combine the references. The Office asserts that it would have been obvious to have modified Curry/Epionet to "translate one or more use case requirements for a specific integrated Web Service business system and one or more technical constraints for the specific

integrated Web Service business system to determine a plurality of Web Service components for an integrated Web Service architecture” as allegedly taught by Siegel “such that tools can automate and thereby simplify most of the building of distributed applications.” However, as noted above, Siegel does not teach these features as recited in claim 18. Furthermore, the methods that are taught by Siegel (MDA tools that “generate interface definitions, application code, makefiles, and configuration files for the PSM’s middleware platform.”) are clearly and distinctly different than the methods taught by Curry and Epionet. The proposed modification to Curry/Epionet could not be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” or of Epionet’s methods as disclosed, as Siegel teaches a completely different method than either reference. “If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.” *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959). Thus, one of ordinary skill would not have combined the teachings of Siegel with the teachings of Curry/Epionet in the manner proposed by the Office. Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

**In further regard to claim 18, the cited references do not teach at least the features of, program instructions executable by a processor to: categorize the Web Service components into two or more related groups according to a Web Services architecture integration framework.**

The Office cites Curry, paragraph [0164], “categorization of components so that a search engine can be used for efficient retrieval,” as allegedly teaching categorizing the Web Service components into two or more related groups according to a Web Services architecture integration framework. However, this paragraph appears in a section titled “Rework” that begins at paragraph [0159]. Paragraph [0160] states “Once the application is completed, a Rework step 34, (see FIG. 1) can be performed to place the newly developed web services in form for addition to the Web Services Master Library.” Paragraph [0161] states “adjudication is performed to determine which of the assets, i.e.,



classes, components, prototypes, applications etc., are in some way suitable for reuse.” Paragraph [0164] states “After testing, a categorization step 206 is performed to sort or index the components so that later discovery and retrieval will be optimized” and “Once the components are categorized they can be published to the Master Library.” Clearly, the “categorization step” for sorting or indexing components to be put into a master library as taught in paragraph [0164] has nothing to do with categorizing Web Service components into two or more related groups according to a Web Services architecture integration framework as part of generating an integrated Web Service architecture for implementing a specific integrated Web Service business system, as recited in claim 18.

**In further regard to claim 18, the Office has failed to establish that the cited references teach, program instructions executable by a processor to: define a plurality of integration tiers for the integrated Web Service architecture and one or more Web Services technologies for the integrated Web Service architecture according to the Web Services architecture integration framework; define how each of the plurality of integration tiers communicates with others of the plurality of integration tiers in the integrated Web Service architecture according to the Web Services architecture integration framework; and organize the groups of Web Service components according to the plurality of integration tiers and two or more layers of the integrated Web Service architecture.**

The Office Action relies on Curry to teach these features, citing paragraphs [0056-59], [0136], and [0151]. However, Curry only teaches that the “framework structure” may include layers, and does not teach organizing the groups of Web Service components according to the plurality of integration tiers and two or more layers of the integrated Web Service architecture. Curry only teaches that the framework may include a number of layers, for example in paragraph [0056]: “The structure includes a number of layers or sub-architectures. Each layer addresses a specific area within a standard web application.” Paragraph [0151] refers to “the logical layers of the application,” which appear to be the same “layers” referred to in paragraph [0056]. Curry does not teach organizing a groups of Web Service components according to a plurality of integration

tiers and two or more layers of the integrated Web Service architecture, as recited in claim 18.

In addition, the Office relied on Curry, paragraph [0164], “categorization of components so that a search engine can be used for efficient retrieval,” as allegedly teaching categorizing the Web Service components into two or more related groups according to a Web Services architecture integration framework. Curry clearly does not teach that these categorized components as taught at paragraph [0164] are organized according to a plurality of integration tiers and two or more layers of the integrated Web Service architecture, as recited in claim 18.

**In further regard to claim 18, the Office has failed to establish a proper *prima facie* reason to combine the references.**

In regard to the proposed combination of Curry and Huang, the Office Action asserts that “it would have been obvious...to have modified Curry such that the web service architecture is generated in accordance with one or more integration design patterns as taught by Huang because design patterns are well known in the art and commonly used by programmers since design patterns provide the benefit of capturing a standard solution to a common programming problem for reuse.” However, Huang teaches four specific design patterns – a Composite pattern, a Mediator pattern, a Command pattern, and a State pattern. It is unclear as to how Curry’s system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” as disclosed. Curry and Huang each propose distinctly different methods for achieving similar results. Modifying Curry with Huang’s specific “design patterns” would appear to necessitate significant changes in Curry’s system. “If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.” *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959). Thus, one of ordinary skill would not have combined the teachings of

Huang with the teachings of Curry in the manner proposed by the Office. Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In the Response to Arguments, 77, on pages 37-38 of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office asserts that it is “not clear...why incorporating the use of design patterns in the development method taught by Curry would necessitate significant changes.” However, as Applicant has noted, Huang teaches four specific design patterns – a Composite pattern, a Mediator pattern, a Command pattern, and a State pattern. These design patterns are specifically intended for use in Huang’s “Web services-based framework for business integration solutions.” (Title). Curry and Huang each propose distinctly different methods for achieving similar results. It is unclear as to how Curry’s system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” as disclosed. Modifying Curry with Huang’s specific “design patterns” would thus appear to necessitate significant changes in Curry’s system. Moreover, while the Office broadly asserts that it is obvious that “one of ordinary skill in the art...would have the necessary skills to use design patterns for that particular problem,” the Office provides no support as to how Curry’s system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” as disclosed.

In regard to the Curry and Epiwave references, the Office Action asserts it would have been obvious that “the system of Curry would include a Web Services architecture design service since the Epiwave toolset used in Curry is capable of planning, prototyping, testing, developing, and deploying web services.” However, at paragraph [0072] Curry states that “In an illustrative embodiment of the invention, the Epiwave™ environment available from the applicant, Epionet Corporation of Dublin, Ireland, serves as the D&D environment in the D&D application creation step 32.” Curry does not describe that other aspects of Curry’s system relied upon by the Office are performed using Epiwave. Moreover, the Office has not explained how a combination of

Epiowave with Curry would result in anything but the system that Curry already teaches. Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 18 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks as those above regarding claim 18 also apply to claims 58 and 82.

Applicant also asserts that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims under the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection is further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

The Office Action on page 23 rejected claims 25, 30, 65 and 89 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry in view of Epionet, and further in view of Siegel, and further in view of Huang, Olsen and Chappell. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims from which these claims depend, a further discussion of this rejection is not necessary at this time.

The Office Action on page 24 rejected claims 26, 66 and 90 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry in view of Epionet, and further in view of Siegel, and further in view Huang, Olsen and Connell. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims from which these claims depend, a further discussion of this rejection is not necessary at this time.

The Office Action on page 25 rejected claims 31, 34, 35, 37-39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry in view of Curtis, et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0115377) (hereinafter “Curtis”), and further in view of Epionet and Huang.

**In regard to claim 31, as a first matter, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach an integrated Web Services business system configured**

**and implemented according to an integrated Web Service architecture generated by a computer-implemented integrated Web Services architecture design service according to a structured integration methodology for designing and generating integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services technologies with business systems comprising heterogeneous components, as recited in amended claim 31.**

As noted above in regards to claim 1, Curry does not teach that the method illustrated in FIG. 1 is a computer-implemented method, and Curry does not describe a computer system that implements the method illustrated in FIG. 1. At most, Curry describes that particular steps or sub-steps of Curry's method may be assisted by or performed using existing software tools. Huang only conceptually describes a framework for developing Web services-based business integration solutions, and does not teach or even suggest a computer implementation of the framework for developing Web services-based business integration solutions. The Epionet/Epiowave references may broadly assert that the toolset may provide for "planning, prototyping, testing, developing, and deploying web services," however, the references do not teach that the Epionet/Epiowave platform performs the elements of the subject matter as recited in claim 31. Curtis, on the other hand, is directed to "customer relationship management architectures" (see, e.g., Curtis, Title, Abstract, paragraph [0001] ("The present invention relates to the field of customer relationship management. More particularly, the present invention, in various specific embodiments, involves methods and systems directed to providing a customer relationship management architecture.") Curtis never mentions web services, and is not directed to web services, and does not teach or suggest is not directed to designing and generating integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services technologies with business systems comprising heterogeneous components.

On page 8 of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office admits that Curry does not teach implementing a Web Services architecture design service to generate integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services with business systems, and asserts that it would have been obvious that "the system of Curry would include a

Web Services architecture design service since the Epiowave toolset used in Curry is capable of planning, prototyping, testing, developing, and deploying web services.” The Office further argues this assertion in the Response to Arguments, 72, on pages 36-37. **However, as noted above, Curry only describes that the “the D&D application creation step 32” of FIG. 1 may be performed using Epiowave.** Curry does not describe that other aspects of Curry’s system relied upon by the Office are performed using Epiowave or any other automated system. Moreover, the Office has not explained how a combination of Epiowave with Curry would result in anything but the system that Curry already teaches, for example as illustrated in FIG. 1. Neither Curry nor any combination of the cited art teaches a computer-implemented system that implements all of the elements of the method as illustrated in Curry’s FIG. 1, nor does Curry or any combination of the cited art teach a Web Services architecture design service that performs all of the elements as recited in claim 18 of the instant application.

In contrast to the cited references, claim 31 recites an integrated Web Services business system is configured and implemented according to an integrated Web Service architecture generated by a computer-implemented integrated Web Services architecture design service according to a structured integration methodology for designing and generating integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services technologies with business systems comprising heterogeneous components such that: the plurality of heterogeneous business components are organized according to a plurality of integration tiers and two or more layers of the integrated Web Service architecture; and one or more design patterns including one or more Web Services integration design patterns for integrating Web Services with business systems are applied to the integrated Web Service architecture, wherein each design pattern models a particular structure that is applicable to the integrated Web Service.

Furthermore, as noted above in regard to claim 1, in paragraph [0055] Curry teaches “The framework includes a pre-built architecture that allows developers to rapidly create applications based on business components and web services.” **Curry does not teach a computer-implemented integrated Web Services architecture**

**design service for generating integrated Web Service architectures as recited in claim 31.** Instead, Curry clearly teaches a “standard framework architecture” that clearly pre-exists and that may allegedly be used to “rapidly create applications based on business components and web services.”

On page 37 of the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office argues that “a specific instance of the framework template must be generated for the web service under development.” However, this “specific instance” would still be just a copy of Curry’s “standard framework architecture” that may be modified, and does not teach a computer-implemented integrated Web Services architecture design service for generating integrated Web Service architectures as recited in claim 31.

**The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach a system as recited in Applicant’s claim 31 when the claim is viewed as a whole.**

**In further regard to claim 31, the cited art does not teach at least the features of wherein the integrated Web Services business system is configured and implemented according to an integrated Web Service architecture generated by a computer-implemented integrated Web Services architecture design service according to a structured integration methodology for designing and generating integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services technologies with business systems comprising heterogeneous components such that: the plurality of heterogeneous business components are organized according to the plurality of integration tiers and two or more layers of the integrated Web Service architecture, as recited in amended claim 31.**

The Office Action relies on Curry to support the assertion that the cited art teaches a plurality of tiers of an integrated Web Services business system, wherein the plurality of tiers comprises a presentation tier, a business tier, and a resources tier, citing “automating layer separability”, paragraphs [0016] and [0028]. The Office admits that

Curry does not teach wherein the plurality of integration tiers also comprise a client tier and an integration tier, and relies on Curtis to teach these features, asserting “Curtis is cited to teach a method for separating an integrated management architecture into tiers, including a client tier, a presentation tier, a business tier, an integration tier, and a resources tier,” citing paragraphs [0007] and [0028]-[0033]. The Office then contends “It would have been obvious...to have modified Curry such that the plurality of tiers also include a client tier and an integration tier because the n-tier architecture for web services is well known in the art (see [0016] of Curry) and separating web services into a tier structure that includes a client tier and an integration tier is also well known (see [0007] of Curtis).”

However, amended claim 31 recites that the plurality of heterogeneous business components of the integrated Web Services business system are organized according to the plurality of integration tiers and two or more layers of the integrated Web Service architecture. Applicants contend that an integrated Web Service architecture including a plurality of integration tiers and two or more layers was not known in the art.

Furthermore, Curtis is directed to “customer relationship management architectures” (see, e.g., Curtis, Title, Abstract, paragraph [0001] (“The present invention relates to the field of customer relationship management. More particularly, the present invention, in various specific embodiments, involves methods and systems directed to providing a customer relationship management architecture.”) Curtis never mentions web services. Thus, the Office’s contention that “separating web services into a tier structure that includes a client tier and an integration tier is also well known” is not supported by Curtis.

**In further regard to claim 31, the Office has failed to establish a proper *prima facie* reason to combine the references.**

In regard to the proposed combination of Curry and Huang, the Office Action asserts that “it would have been obvious...to have modified Curry such that the web



service architecture is generated in accordance with one or more integration design patterns as taught by Huang because design patterns are well known in the art and commonly used by programmers since design patterns provide the benefit of capturing a standard solution to a common programming problem for reuse.” However, Huang teaches four specific design patterns – a Composite pattern, a Mediator pattern, a Command pattern, and a State pattern. It is unclear as to how Curry’s system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” as disclosed. Curry and Huang each propose distinctly different methods for achieving similar results. Modifying Curry with Huang’s specific “design patterns” would appear to necessitate significant changes in Curry’s system. “If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.” *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959). Thus, one of ordinary skill would not have combined the teachings of Huang with the teachings of Curry in the manner proposed by the Office. Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In the Response to Arguments, 77, on pages 37-38 of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office asserts that it is “not clear...why incorporating the use of design patterns in the development method taught by Curry would necessitate significant changes.” However, as Applicant has noted, Huang teaches four specific design patterns – a Composite pattern, a Mediator pattern, a Command pattern, and a State pattern. These design patterns are specifically intended for use in Huang’s “Web services-based framework for business integration solutions.” (Title). Curry and Huang each propose distinctly different methods for achieving similar results. It is unclear as to how Curry’s system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” as disclosed. Modifying Curry with Huang’s specific “design patterns” would thus appear to necessitate significant changes in Curry’s system. Moreover, while the Office broadly asserts that it is obvious that “one of ordinary skill in

the art...would have the necessary skills to use design patterns for that particular problem,” the Office provides no support as to how Curry’s system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” as disclosed.

In regard to the Curry and Epiowave references, the Office Action asserts it would have been obvious that “the system of Curry would include a Web Services architecture design service since the Epiowave toolset used in Curry is capable of planning, prototyping, testing, developing, and deploying web services.” However, at paragraph [0072] Curry states that “In an illustrative embodiment of the invention, the Epiowave™ environment available from the applicant, Epionet Corporation of Dublin, Ireland, serves as the D&D environment in the D&D application creation step 32.” Curry does not describe that other aspects of Curry’s system relied upon by the Office are performed using Epiowave. Moreover, the Office has not explained how a combination of Epiowave with Curry would result in anything but the system that Curry already teaches. Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 31 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicant also asserts that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims under the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection is further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

The Office Action on page 30 rejected claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry in view of Curtis, and further in view of Epionet, Huang and Connell. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims from which these claims depend, a further discussion of this rejection is not necessary at this time.

The Office Action on page 31 rejected claims 36 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry in view of Curtis, and further in view of Epionet, Huang and Chappell. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims from which these claims depend, a further discussion of this rejection is not necessary at this time.

The Office Action on page 32 rejected claims 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry in view of Huang, and further in view of Olsen. Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the reasons indicated below.

**In regard to claim 42, as a first matter, neither of the cited references (Curry and Huang) teach computer-implemented means for generating integrated Web Service architectures.**

As noted above in regards to claim 1, Curry does not teach that the method illustrated in FIG. 1 is a computer-implemented method, and Curry does not describe a computer system that implements the method illustrated in FIG. 1. At most, Curry describes that particular steps or sub-steps of Curry's method may be assisted by or performed using existing software tools. Huang only conceptually describes a framework for developing Web services-based business integration solutions, and does not teach or even suggest a computer implementation of the framework for developing Web services-based business integration solutions. Olsen only teaches that generic web services are customized according to input information and does not teach program instructions executable by a processor to generate integrated Web Service architectures for integrating Web Services with business systems.

In contrast to the cited art, claim 42 recites computer-implemented means for generating an integrated Web Services architecture for integrating a specific Web Service with a specific business system.

Furthermore, as noted above in regard to claim 1, in paragraph [0055] Curry teaches “The framework includes a pre-built architecture that allows developers to rapidly create applications based on business components and web services.” **Curry does not teach an integrated Web Service architecture that is generated by computer-implemented means for generating an integrated Web Services architecture for integrating a Web Service with a business system comprising a plurality of heterogeneous components.** Instead, Curry only teaches a “standard framework architecture” that clearly pre-exists and that may allegedly be used to “rapidly create applications based on business components and web services.”

On page 37 of the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office argues that “a specific instance of the framework template must be generated for the web service under development.” However, this “specific instance” would still be just a copy of Curry’s “standard framework architecture” that may be modified, and does not teach a system comprising program instructions executable to implement a Web Services architecture design service configured to generate an integrated Web Service architecture for integrating a specific Web Service with a specific business system, as recited in Applicant’s claims.

**The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach a system for integrating Web Services with business systems as recited in Applicant’s claim 42 when the claim is viewed as a whole.**

**In further regard to claim 42, the cited art fails to teach at least the features of computer-implemented means for applying a Web Services structured methodology and one or more design patterns to the generated integrated Web Service architecture to identify a plurality of integrated Web Service components including one or more of the business system components and to organize the integrated Web Service components according to the integrated Web Service architecture, wherein the plurality of integrated Web Service components are**

**organized according to two or more integration tiers and two or more layers of the integrated Web Service architecture, as recited in amended claim 42.**

Curry only teaches a framework that may include a number of layers, for example in paragraph [0056]: “The structure includes a number of layers or sub-architectures. Each layer addresses a specific area within a standard web application.” Curry does not teach a plurality of integrated Web Service components organized according to two or more integration tiers and two or more layers of the integrated Web Service architecture, as recited in amended claim 42. The other cited references fail to overcome this shortcoming.

**In further regard to claim 42, the Office has failed to establish a proper *prima facie* reason to combine the Curry and Huang references.**

The Office Action asserts that “it would have been obvious...to have modified Curry such that the web service architecture is generated in accordance with one or more integration design patterns as taught by Huang because design patterns are well known in the art and commonly used by programmers since design patterns provide the benefit of capturing a standard solution to a common programming problem for reuse.” However, Huang teaches four specific design patterns – a Composite pattern, a Mediator pattern, a Command pattern, and a State pattern. It is unclear as to how Curry’s system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” as disclosed. Curry and Huang each propose distinctly different methods for achieving similar results. Modifying Curry with Huang’s specific “design patterns” would appear to necessitate significant changes in Curry’s system. “If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.” *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959). Thus, one of ordinary skill would not have combined the teachings of

Huang with the teachings of Curry in the manner proposed by the Office. Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In the Response to Arguments, 77, on pages 37-38 of the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Office asserts that it is “not clear...why incorporating the use of design patterns in the development method taught by Curry would necessitate significant changes.” However, as Applicant has noted, Huang teaches four specific design patterns – a Composite pattern, a Mediator pattern, a Command pattern, and a State pattern. These design patterns are specifically intended for use in Huang’s “Web services-based framework for business integration solutions.” (Title). Curry and Huang each propose distinctly different methods for achieving similar results. It is unclear as to how Curry’s system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” as disclosed. Modifying Curry with Huang’s specific “design patterns” would thus appear to necessitate significant changes in Curry’s system. Moreover, while the Office broadly asserts that it is obvious that “one of ordinary skill in the art...would have the necessary skills to use design patterns for that particular problem,” the Office provides no support as to how Curry’s system would be modified with these specific design patterns, much less how the modification could be made without changing the principle of operation of Curry’s “Web services development method” as disclosed.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 42 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicant also asserts that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims under the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection is further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

The Office Action on page 35 rejected claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Curry in view of Huang, and further in view of Olsen and Chappell. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims from which these claims depend, a further discussion of this rejection is not necessary at this time.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-66303/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255  
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: September 24, 2010